

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Criminal File No. 11-87 (MJD/JJK)

(9) OLUGBENGA TEMIDAGO ADENIRAN,

Defendant.

Ann M. Anaya, Assistant United States Attorney, Counsel for Plaintiff.

Daniel Mohs, Law Office of Daniel Mohs, Counsel for Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Olubenga Temidago Adeniran's pro se letter motion for appointment of new counsel. [Docket No. 600] The Court denied Defendant's previous letter request for new counsel on January 30, 2012.

"A defendant must show justifiable dissatisfaction with appointed counsel in order to be granted a substitute." United States v. Exxon, 328 F.3d 456, 460 (8th Cir. 2003). The decision whether to grant a motion for appointment of new counsel is within the discretion of the district court. Id. The Court has

thoroughly reviewed Defendant's most recent letter, as well as his previous letters to the Court, is familiar with his counsel's work in this matter so far, and is familiar with the legal arguments that Defendant wishes that his counsel would raise in this case. The Court has also considered Defendant's allegations regarding the communications between counsel and Defendant. The Court finds that Defendant has not shown justifiable dissatisfaction with his appointed counsel.

Accordingly, based upon the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

Defendant Olubenga Temidago Adeniran's motion for new counsel [Docket No. 600] is **DENIED**.

Dated: February 3, 2012

s/ Michael J. Davis

Michael J. Davis

Chief Judge

United States District Court